

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/551,871	04/18/2000	Kazunari Yoshida	0020-4699P	2420
7590 03/02/2004			EXAMINER	
Birch Stewart Kolasch & Birch LLP			HUNTER, ALVIN A	
P.O. Box 747 Falls Church, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			3711	3/
			DATE MAILED: 02/02/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<b>5</b> /
	Application No.	pplicant(s)
	09/551,871	YOSHIDA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alvin A. Hunter	3711
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>16 Ja</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This     Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4)  Claim(s) 1 and 3-5 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the conference of the	epted or b) objected to by the formal of the following of the left in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing (s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). sected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)     Information Disclösure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)     Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)

Art Unit: 3711

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (USPN 5184828).

Kim et al. discloses a three-piece golf ball having a inner core, outer core, and cover wherein the golf ball exhibits superior rebounding and carrying characteristics (See Column 1, lines 42 through 60). Kim et al. discloses the inner core having a central hardness of 30 to 48 Shore D, or 50 to 73 JIS-C, and a hardness at the outer site of the inner core of 46 to 62 Shore D, or 71 to 92 JIS-C (See Abstract and Figure 1). The inner core also has a diameter of 23 to 35 mm (See Figure 1). The outer core has a hardness of 30 to 56, or 50 to 84 JIS-C, and a diameter of 36 to 41mm (See Abstract). From the disclosed ranges for the inner and outer core above, the outer core can have a thickness from at least 1mm to 18mm. As shown above, the outer core is less than the surface hardness of the inner core by at least 21, and the surface hardness of the inner core is higher than the central hardness of the inner core by at least 21. It is also noted that both the inner and outer cores are made of polybutadiene, a co-crosslinking agent, an organic peroxide and fillers (See Columns 3 and 4).

Art Unit: 3711

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (USPN 5184828) in view of Hanada et al. (USPN 4483537).

Kim et al. discloses that the co-crosslinking agent may a metal salt such as zinc diacrylate, zinc dimethacrylate, and the like, but does not disclose the co-crosslinking being magnesium methacrylate. Tanaka et al discloses a core having a metal salt co-crosslinking agent from the group of zinc acrylate, magnesium acrylate zinc methacrylate, and magnesium methacrylate (See Paragraph bridging Columns 2 and 3). It is submitted that used of Magnesium methacrylate is a substitutional material for that of a zinc acrylate type. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found the invention of Kim et al. to perform substantially the same substituting magnesium methacrylate for any other metal salt in order to increase the rebounding characteristics of the golf ball.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (USPN 5184828).

Kim et al. does not disclose the outer core having a thickness of 0.2 to 0.9mm. In spite of having not disclosing the above thickness. Kim et al. notes that the diameter ranges affect the ball's characteristics. If the inner core is greater than 35mm, the ball

Art Unit: 3711

becomes harder, in other words, more resilient, and if the outer core diameter is less than 36mm, the carrying distance is reduced. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art would have found it a matter of obvious routine optimization to have the outer core of a thickness of 0.2 to 0.9mm in order to achieve any desired resilience and carrying distance for the golf ball.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (USPN 5184828) in view of Horiuchi et al. (USPN 5702312).

Kim et al. discloses that the cover is made of an ionomer resin such as Surlyn™ and has a thickness of 0.9 to 2.6mm, but does not disclose the hardness of the cover (See Column 6, lines 31 through 38). Horiuchi et al. discloses a three-piece solid golf ball having a cover made of an ionomer, such as Surlyn, having a Shore D hardness of 52 to 64 wherein the cover hardness attributes good flight distance, controllability, and feel to the golf ball (See Columns 2 and 3). One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have a cover with a Shore D hardness, particularly of 58 to 75, in order to optimized the flight distance, controllability, and feel of the golf ball.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alvin A. Hunter whose telephone number is 703-306-

Art Unit: 3711

5693. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30AM

to 4:00PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Garbe, can be reached on 703-308-1207. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AAA Alvin A. Hunter, Jr.

Stephen P. Garbe Primary Examiner Page 5